

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-7, 10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slooten (US 6,229,582) in view of Gothard (US 5,276,378).

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slooten in view of Gothard and further in view of Buzak et al. (US 6,016,032).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claim 1 to further define the invention and added new dependent claim 21. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are pending with claims 8, 9, and 15-20 having been withdrawn from consideration.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-7, 10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slooten (US 6,229,582) in view of Gothard (US 5,276,378), and claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Slooten in view of Gothard and further in view of Buzak et al. (US 6,016,032).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as being based upon a combination of prior art references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 10-14.

Van Slooten, Gothard and/or Buzak et al., whether taken singly or combined, neither teach nor suggest a flat lamp including at least "a bottom having a single channel including a plurality of bends uniformly crossing an entire surface thereof," as recited by amended independent claim 1. In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, each of the plasma channels

30, 30', and 30", as shown in FIG. 2 of Van Slooten, are single grooves formed across the second substrate 39. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Van Slooten neither teaches nor suggests Applicant's claimed features including a bottom having a single channel "including a plurality of bends uniformly crossing an entire surface thereof," as recited by amended independent claim 1.

Applicant notes that the Office Action does not rely on Gothard and/or Buzak et al. to teach or suggest these features. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Gothard and/or Buzak et al. cannot remedy this deficiency.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(x) should be withdrawn because Van Slooten, Gothard and/or Buzak et al., whether taken individually or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 10-14.

**Request for Consideration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.141**

As indicated in the Restriction Requirement mail dated May 20, 2003, upon allowance of a generic claim (i.e., claim 1), "Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of non-elected claims 8 and 9 upon allowance of generic claim 1.

**New Claim 21**

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of new dependent claim 21, which is believed to be readable upon elected Specie 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is allowable for at least its dependence upon allowable generic claim 1, and for the features that claim 21 recites.

**Conclusions**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell  
Mary Jane Boswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: September 16, 2003

Customer Number: 009629  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-739-3000

1-WA/20/0827.1